



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,284	02/26/2004	Paul M. Skonezny	GY0111 (NP)	5398
23914	7590	04/18/2008		
LOUIS J. WILLE BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY PATENT DEPARTMENT P O BOX 4000 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000			EXAMINER WALICKA, MALGORZATA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/18/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@BMS.COM
patents@bms.com
eileen.immordino@bms.com

Art Unit: 1652

The response filed Jan 18, 2008, comprising amendments to the claims and applicants' REMARKS regarding the Office Action mailed to applicants October 18, 2007, is acknowledged. Claims 1, 10-13 and 22-24 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 14-17, 19 and 20 have been amended. Pending claims 2-6, 8-9, 14-21 and 25-26 are pending and under examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Rejections not repeated herein are withdrawn due to amendments or moot due to the cancellation of the claims.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 14-18, 20 and 25-26 are rejected over Farina et al., US Patent 5,011,774 published Oct. 1991, in view of Daddona et al., published Oct. 1884 and common knowledge in the art as exemplified by Dessouki et al., published 2002. The reasons for rejection were explained in the last Office Action of May 9, 2007 and repeated in the Office Action of Oct. 18, 2007 (last action).

Claims 19 and 21 are rejected over Farina et al., US Patent 5,011,774 published Oct. 1991 (quoted in IDS), in view of Daddona et al., published Oct. 1884 (quoted in IDS) and common knowledge in the art as exemplified by Dessouki et al., published 2002 (quoted in IDS) and Beach et al (*Strategy for Industrial Scale Production of Dideoxyinosine: Enzymatic Deamination of Dideoxyadenosine by Adenosine*

Art Unit: 1652

Deaminase, Nucleosides and Nucleotides, 1991, 10/7, 1499-1505, included in IDS).

The reasons for the rejection are the same as those explained in the last action.

Response to Applicants arguments

In the REMARKS, page 6 of 7 Applicants present their position as follows.

- 1) The Office has failed to provide a sound basis to combine the references in the manner suggested.
- 2) “Each test for prima facie obviousness applied by the Patent Office, e.g., the ‘differences between the prior art and the claims’ must be consistent with the legal principles enunciated in KSR.”
- 3) “ While the KSR Court rejected a rigid application of the teaching, suggestion, or motivation (‘TSM’) test in an obviousness inquiry, the Court acknowledged the importance of identifying ‘a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does’ in an obviousness determination. KSR, t27 S”,

and further

“Thus, in cases involving new methods, it remains necessary to identify some reason that would have led a chemist to modify a known process in a particular manner to establish prima facie obviousness of a new claimed method.”

Art Unit: 1652

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are found not persuasive for the following reasons.

Regarding point 1), it is not clear why the combination of the references in the manner suggested by the examiner in her rejection is lacking "sound basis", because in the rejection the examiner wrote

"It would have been obvious for one having skills in the art, who would like to produce the anti-HIV drug ddI, to use teachings of Farina et al. and replace calf enzyme of Farina by human adenosine deaminase taught by Daddona",
page 5 line 11, and in the last paragraph of page 5,

"The motivation is provided by Farina et al: 'Although adenosine deaminase (ADA) from calf spleen was used in the actual examples, it is believed that any preparation of adenosine aminohydrolase (or 'deaminase,' EC 3.5.4.4.) would be suitable, column 6, line 8. Human adenine deaminase disclosed by applicants is a preparation of an adenosine aminohydrolase, or 'deaminase', and is classified as EC 3.5.4.4."

. Applicants furthermore, do not provide any specific reasons why the combination of the references in the examiner's manner is not "sound".

Regarding point 2) differences between the prior art and the claims are as they are and were clearly identified by the rejection. Applicants' do not provide any specific reasons why the analysis of these differences performed by the examiner is not consistent with the legal principles enunciated in KSR.

Regarding point 3), the 103 rejection presented in the previous actions is consistent even with a rigid application of the TSM test in the obviousness inquiry. The examiner clearly identifies in the body of the rejection the reasons that would have led a

Art Unit: 1652

chemist to modify a known process in a particular manner. Applicants do not explain why, and which of, the reasons explained by the examiner are not sufficient or improper.

In summary, Applicants' argument being not persuasive are not sufficient to withdraw the rejection of claims 2-6, 8-9, 14-18, 19, 20, 21 and 25-26 under 35 USC section 103.

Conclusion

All claims are rejected. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Malgorzata A. Walicka whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1652

(571) 272-0944. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat Nashed, can be reached on (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Malgorzata A. Walicka, Ph.D.
Art Unit 1652
Patent Examiner

/Rebecca E. Prouty/
Primary Examiner,
Art Unit 1652